

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PHYLLIS SANTISTEVAN-SULLIVAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRANSDIGM GROUP INCORPORATED
et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-00186-TL

ORDER ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS

Plaintiff Phyllis Santistevan-Sullivan raises claims of discrimination and whistleblower retaliation against her former employer and related business entity Defendants AvtechTyee Inc and Transdigm Group Incorporated. This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for a Protective Order to Quash Subpoenas (Dkt. No. 26), Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Responses to Written Discovery (Dkt. No. 32), and Defendant's Amended LCR 37 Submission (Dkt. No. 43) seeking entry of this district's model protective order and an order compelling Plaintiff to respond to specified discovery requests. On February 14, 2024, the Court held a hearing on the motions, which was attended by counsel for the Parties. Dkt. No. 45. Having reviewed the

relevant record, hearing the Parties' oral arguments on each motion, and being fully advised on the issues, and for the reasons stated on the record at the hearing, the Court ORDERS as follows:

1. The Court GRANTS Defendants' motion for entry of the Western District of Washington's Model Stipulated Protective Order ("MPO") included in their Amended LCR 37 Submission. Dkt. No. 43. The Parties SHALL file a stipulated motion for entry of the MPO within **five (5) days** of the date of this Order. Defendants SHALL then produce all previously withheld and identified confidential documents pursuant to the MPO within **ten (10) days** of the date of entry of the protective order.¹
2. The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Responses to Written Discovery. Dkt. No. 32. Upon entry of the MPO and supplemental document production as ordered above, the Court further ORDERS Defendants to supplement their written discovery responses as agreed during the hearing within **fourteen (14) days** of the document production. The supplemental responses shall not include any ambiguous caveats or boilerplate objections.²
3. The Court GRANTS Defendants' motion to compel responses to discovery requests included in their Amended LCR 37 Submission. Dkt. No. 43. The Court ORDERS Plaintiff to respond to Defendants' requests for production numbers 1 through 12, but Plaintiff need not respond to the extent the requests use the phrase "refute or rebut." Plaintiff shall provide her discovery responses within **fourteen (14) days** of the date of this Order.

¹ This is a modification from the Court's ruling from the bench that initially set Defendants' deadline to produce documents to 10 days from the date of the hearing.

² To avoid any potential confusion, the Court is not ordering Defendants to reformat or resubmit any previous discovery responses.

Dated this 14th day of February 2024.

ORDER ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS - 3